

Can it really be true that Sinclair Broadcasting is forcing their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election? If so, that is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation, it's clearly illegal (and with good reason).

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. However, when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for their bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

If Sinclair insists on electioneering or campaigning with public airwaves, then they had better do it in a bi-partisan way by also showing a pro-Kerry documentary immediately afterward.

Thank you.